

14 May 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: Visit to Bureau of Printing and Engraving

1. On 13 May, members of the CLAS team spent about two hours at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing learning about BEP's experience with the Cullinet financial and manufacturing packages. The Agency visitors included [REDACTED] of Finance, [REDACTED] of Logistics, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of Information Technology, and [REDACTED] of Audit Staff. The Bureau participants included project director Richard Laird, Marilyn Campbell of data processing, Tom Rogers of manufacturing, Jim Swan of inventory and receiving, and Jim Reesch and Tom Liebrand of finance.

2. In response to a question from [REDACTED] about the Bureau's accounting system, Laird said that BEP has a revolving fund concept with an apportionment but no appropriation. The fund was established to operate on a break-even basis but with neither appropriation nor borrowing authority and with a need for cash to recapitalize its equipment, the Bureau was allowed to levy a surcharge to acquire the funds. Nonetheless, BEP keeps its books on an accrual basis. [REDACTED] noted that the Agency was in the opposite position and kept its accounts on a cash basis.

3. Laird noted that bridging to the general ledger is difficult without funds control. He indicated that commitments were made on internal requisitions and the obligation occurred when the purchase order was cut. Because the present Cullinet purchasing package (Version 1.2) does not go back to the requisition as a check on the obligation, BEP developed its own program to check against the commitment file. Laird says this problem should be solved when Cullinet's Version 1.3 becomes available. Right now the open requisition transaction is being checked by budget people for approval because 1.2 Accounts Payable has no funds availability check.

4. Campbell said that the initial transition to Cullinet's General Ledger had not been that difficult because BEP had already had the McCormick-Dodge g.l. package to which Cullinet had bought the rights. She also pointed out that the Bureau had a small data processing staff consisting of some nine programmers and three doing data base administration. The assistance of Price-Waterhouse as the integration contractor was another key advantage. Currently there are some 40 finance users and 200 production, i.e. manufacturing, users with seldom more than 20 on-line at the same time. The system is expanding, however, and is planned to provide support to virtually all 2,200 employees.

5. Rogers observed that, contrary to popular opinion, the Cullinet packages were not inflexible. He suggested, however, that it was prudent to keep the system as simple as possible to enhance user acceptance, particularly among production workers. Swan agreed and added that no two people did a job exactly the same way in the inventory process so that the lack of a uniform procedure actually hastened the adoption of the new procedures required by the Cullinet system. He said that resistance to the new way of doing things only lasted a few weeks.

6. In answer to [] question as to how BEP created RFQs and RFIs, Laird said they don't create them and instead use purchase orders. He also noted that the Bureau overcommits, because it does not know just which major projects will be carried through to completion.

STAT

7. Campbell urged that the Agency become active in the Cullinet users groups. She said that the annual users' week held each fall was a particularly good opportunity to learn about what directions Cullinet was taking as well as providing an opportunity to apprise Cullinet of user assessments of current software capabilities and shortcomings. She noted that there was a local seminar being held in mid-June. The fall meeting for 1987 will be in Anaheim. During this discussion, Campbell said that she had heard that Version 1.3 was not expected until April, 1988 rather than January as we anticipated.

8. Next [] asked about BEP's experience in seeking modifications to Cullinet software. Earlier Campbell had said that the Bureau's approach had been to depart from the Cullinet system in the following order: a) use batch processing; b) develop on-line supplementary programs; c) modify Cullinet code. She then said that Cullinet packages have some limitations in data field size (e.g. a maximum order quantity of 99,999,999.999) that make it inadequate for BEP's needs for currency and stamp production. As a result, the Bureau is going to modify the Cullinet schema to accommodate its requirements. Cullinet had first suggested that BEP change its unit of measure to handle the problem but that approach is simply not feasible.

STAT

9. Campbell said that Cullinet's quality assurance had gotten much better since BEP had first begun to install Cullinet packages in July 1984 when it loaded the General Ledger. Since the summer of 1985, Cullinet packages have gotten more bug-free and Cullinet has appeared to listen to and respond to BEP complaints. She noted that the phased implementation approach that BEP has used has helped it to circumvent a number of problems. Campbell said that she was not especially concerned about the prospect of migrating from 1.2 to 1.3, having already made the move from 1.1 to 1.2. She noted that BEP used Endeavor for tracking documentation.

10. Several BEP members then offered suggestions about bringing the Cullinet packages into production. Swan said that in doing inventory conversion, he would advise against converting open purchase orders from the old to the new system. Rogers said that it was important to ensure that management understood that there were certain to be some problems and they had to be prepared to help to deal with them and provide a supportive attitude to the project. Reesch advised not to bring up Accounts Payable first because that could lead to some nasty problems in accrual accounting. The matching function in inventory and purchasing would pave the way to a smooth transition. Bring up General Ledger first.

11. Campbell repeated her advice to use phased implementation rather than parallel implementation, which was simply too costly in skilled personnel. She said that there isn't a great deal of Cullinet expertise around. She noted that corporate memory was important and advised that internal staffers be used for key elements of the job. Still, BEP credited much of its success to its integration contractor.

12. At the close of the session there was some discussion of Culprit and OLQ and of the supplementary software tools that the Bureau found helpful in learning and using the Cullinet packages. Reesch said that Culprit reports were fairly easy to modify and that Cullinet reviewed the special reports BEP developed and would probably incorporate at least some of their features within the packages themselves. Campbell noted that OLQ is a voracious resource hog and is only used by data processing staff to debug user problems. BEP had acquired Workbench but had not yet begun to use it. It did use the DBMS/DB tool kit and used Latterman for dictionary migration.

13. thanked the BEP people on behalf of the Agency visitors and said that we would like to keep the channels of communication between the two groups open and active.

STAT